<!-- /\* Style Definitions \*/ p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal {mso-style-parent:""; margin:0in; margin-bottom:.0001pt; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:12.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";} @page Section1 {size:8.5in 11.0in; margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in; mso-header-margin:.5in; mso-footer-margin:.5in; mso-paper-source:0;} div.Section1 {page:Section1;} -->

I would like to thank you for pulling together this meeting.

I look at TCAAP as having 3 options.

The first option is negotiated sale. There seems to be no support at the Federal level for this option, which is good. Since it has already been proven that any development would need a substantial amount of public financing, and if TIF was used, it has been proven that the base tax would not cover the costs of city provided services. Looking at some of the development ideas being thrown around, they appear to be sustainable only as long as there is public funding. After the TIF district expires, all the tax from the district is going to have to go right back to the area for all the 30 year old infrastructure, and other improvements and maintenance needed. There are also major property transfer issues, for example, how does the City get the land to the chosen whoevers.

Which brings me to the next option, public auction. Here the City has limited control. There would be a patchwork of development versus one continuous flow. It may not be the quality of development Arden Hills wants. In addition, there is no guarantee that a purchaser may choose to develop or clean up the land in an acceptable time frame.

A purchaser might realize that they have bitten off more than they expected and could walk away. It will be difficult for the adjacent landowner to develop something of high quality with a half dug hole of polluted land next to them. Eventually, the city would have to get involved to clean up the land in order to move development forward. Another fear is that the purchasers would not receive a certificate of completion from Mn PCA, and PCA could come back at any time with clean up issues, causing a whole other set of issues.

In addition, there are only 2 substandard access points to the property and there is no local funding available for the millions of dollars needed for interchanges improvements. We know that an MnDot improvement for a 35W expansion isn't in my lifetime thus creating additional traffic problems.

The next option is open space, parkland, and recreation use. First off, my idea of open space is not viewing AHATS thru a 6-foot chain link fence with barbed wire on top.

I have surveyed a few residents, 117 want TCAAP to be all open space and parkland, 2 want residential only, 2 want mixed use and I have 1 unsure. In 1994, when the Rep. Vento formed the TCAAP reutilization committee, many of the participants wanted TCAAP to be parkland. They where told that this was not an option due to clean-up costs. To date Army has spent about \$187 million cleaning up TCAAP, (\$105 million since 1994). Considering TCAAP for open space and Parkland should be a viable option now.

June 22, 2009 - Submitted Testimony - Council Member Brenda Holden, Arden Hills						